

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

ANTHONY MEEKS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:05-cv-193  
HON. R. ALLAN EDGAR

FABIAN LAVIGNE, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff Anthony Meeks, an inmate at the Bellamy Creek Correctional Facility, filed this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against defendants Chippewa Correctional Facility former Warden Fabian LaVigne, current Warden Jeri-Ann Sherry, ARUM M. Mather, ADW D. Danley, mail room employee John Doe, United States Postmaster Daniel Windsor, and United States Post Office mail carrier John Doe. Summons and complaint were served on John Doe defendants Dennis Farney and Derek Smith on June 29, 2006.

Plaintiff alleges in his complaint that he handed a delayed application for leave to appeal and a disbursement for the Michigan Court of Appeals in two yellow envelopes to defendant ARUM M. Mather. Plaintiff attempted to file an appeal of the denial of a motion for relief from judgment under MCR 6.500. A motion under MCR 6.500 is not a direct appeal from a conviction, but rather is available for post appeal relief. Plaintiff states that he addressed the letters to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals Division. Plaintiff learned on September 28, 2004, that he did not have anything filed before the Michigan Court of Appeals. Plaintiff wrote to the Gaylord Post Office.

The post office informed plaintiff that they could not determine if the specific item of mail was ever received or sent through the post office. Plaintiff has asserted a violation of his First and Fourteenth Amendment rights. The only remaining defendants are the two prison mail room John Doe defendants, Derek Smith and Dennis Farney and Fabian Lavigne and M. Mather. On January 25, 2007, default was entered against defendants Dennis Farney and Derek Smith.

Defendants Mather and Lavigne have moved for summary judgment. Summary judgment is appropriate only if the moving party establishes that there is no genuine issue of material fact for trial and that he is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322-323 (1986). If the movant carries the burden of showing there is an absence of evidence to support a claim or defense, then the party opposing the motion must demonstrate by affidavits, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, that there is a genuine issue of material fact for trial. *Id.* at 324-25. The nonmoving party cannot rest on its pleadings but must present “specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.” *Id.* at 324 (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)). The evidence must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 251-52 (1986). Thus, any direct evidence offered by the plaintiff in response to a summary judgment motion must be accepted as true. *Muhammad v. Close*, 379 F.3d 413, 416 (6th Cir. 2004) (citing *Adams v. Metiva*, 31 F.3d 375, 382 (6th Cir. 1994)). However, a mere scintilla of evidence in support of the nonmovant’s position will be insufficient. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 251-52. Ultimately, the court must determine whether there is sufficient “evidence on which the jury could reasonably find for the plaintiff.” *Id.* at 252. *See also Leahy v. Trans Jones, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 136, 139 (6th Cir. 1993) (single affidavit, in presence of other evidence to the contrary, failed to present genuine issue of fact); *cf. Moore, Owen, Thomas*

& Co. v. Coffey, 992 F.2d 1439, 1448 (6th Cir. 1993) (single affidavit concerning state of mind created factual issue).

Defendant LaVigne contends that plaintiff's claims against him in his official capacity are barred by Eleventh Amendment immunity. Defendants LaVigne and Mather argue that the claims against them in their individual capacities are barred by qualified immunity. The Eleventh Amendment bars litigants from suing a state in federal court. When a suit for damages is brought against a state official in his official capacity, the case is one against the state and is barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *Hafer v. Melo*, 502 U.S. 21 (1991). Such a suit "generally represent[s] only another way of pleading an action against an entity of which an officer is an agent." *Id.* at 25 (quoting *Monell v. New York City Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 690, n.55 (1978)). See also *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 165 (1985). As a result, the suit is no different from one naming the state itself. *Hafer*, 502 U.S. at 26 (quoting *Will v. Michigan Department of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989)).

Government officials, performing discretionary functions, generally are shielded from liability for civil damages insofar as their conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known. *Dietrich v. Burrows*, 167 F.3d 1007, 1012 (6th Cir. 1999); *Turner v. Scott*, 119 F.3d 425, 429 (6th Cir. 1997); *Noble v. Schmitt*, 87 F.3d 157, 160 (6th Cir. 1996); *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982). An "objective reasonableness" test is used to determine whether the official could reasonably have believed his conduct was lawful. *Dietrich*, 167 F.3d at 1012; *Anderson v. Creighton*, 483 U.S. 635, 641 (1987).

The procedure for evaluating claims of qualified immunity is tripartite: First, we determine whether a constitutional violation occurred; second, we determine whether the right that

was violated was a clearly established right of which a reasonable person would have known; finally, we determine whether the plaintiff has alleged sufficient facts, and supported the allegations by sufficient evidence, to indicate that what the official allegedly did was objectively unreasonable in light of the clearly established constitutional rights. *Williams v. Mehra*, 186 F.3d 685, 690 (6th Cir. 1999).

When determining whether a right is clearly established, this court must look first to decisions of the United States Supreme Court, then to decisions of the Sixth Circuit and to other courts within this Circuit, and finally to decisions of other circuits. *Dietrich*, 167 F.3d at 1012. An official action is not necessarily protected by qualified immunity merely because the very action in question has not previously been held to be unlawful. Rather, in light of pre-existing law, the unlawfulness of the official's conduct must be apparent. *Dietrich*, 167 F.3d at 1012; *Wegener v. City of Covington*, 933 F.2d 390, 392 (6th Cir. 1991).

When making a qualified immunity analysis, the facts must be interpreted in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. Part of the analysis is to determine whether there are any genuinely disputed questions of material fact. *Kain v. Nesbitt*, 156 F.3d 669, 672 (6th Cir. 1998). Where there is a genuinely disputed question of fact, it is for the trier of fact to resolve, not the judge. “This would be true notwithstanding that the trial judge found the [defendant] officer to be more credible than the plaintiff because it is not for the court to make credibility determinations at this stage of the proceeding.” *Id.*

The operation of the qualified immunity standard depends substantially upon the level of generality at which the relevant legal rule is to be identified.

The contours of the right must be sufficiently clear that a reasonable official would understand that what he is doing violates that right. This is not to say that an official action is protected by qualified immunity unless the very action in question has previously been held unlawful, but it is to say that in light of the preexisting law the unlawfulness must be apparent.

*Anderson*, 483 U.S. at 639-40. *See also Durham v. Nu 'Man*, 97 F.3d 862, 866 (6th Cir. 1996), *cert. denied*, 520 U.S. 1157 (1997).

The Sixth Circuit has observed:

A right is not considered clearly established unless it has been authoritatively decided by the United States Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, or the highest court of the state in which the alleged constitutional violation occurred.

*Durham*, 97 F.3d at 866 (citing *Robinson v. Bibb*, 840 F.2d 349, 351 (6th Cir. 1988)).

Thus qualified immunity is not triggered only where the very action in question was previously held unlawful. *Anderson*, 483 U.S. at 639-40. Rather, the test is whether the contours of the right were sufficiently clear that a reasonable official would understand that what he is doing violated plaintiff's federal rights. *Id.*

Furthermore, a defendant need not actively participate in unlawful conduct in order to be liable under Section 1983. Rather, a defendant may be liable where he has a duty to protect a plaintiff and fails to comply with this duty. *Durham*, 97 F.3d at 866-868 (holding that a nurse and a security guard at a state hospital may be liable under Section 1983 where they do not take action to prevent a patient from being beaten). *See also McHenry v. Chadwick*, 896 F.2d 184 (6th Cir. 1990)(a correctional officer who observes an unlawful beating may be liable under Section 1983 even though he did not actively participate in the beating), and *Bruner v. Dunaway*, 684 F.2d 422 (6th Cir. 1982), *cert. denied sub nom, Bates v. Bruner*, 459 U.S. 1171 (1983)(police officers who

stood by and observed an unlawful beating by fellow officers could be held liable under Section 1983).

When faced with a qualified immunity defense, the court must first determine whether or not the plaintiff has stated a claim upon which relief can be granted. *Siegert v. Gilley*, 500 U.S. 226, 232 (1991); *Turner*, 119 F.3d at 429. If the court answers that question in the affirmative, the court goes on to determine whether or not the right allegedly violated was clearly established. *Turner*, 119 F.3d at 429. These are both purely legal questions. The immunity issue should not be resolved if there are factual disputes on which the issue of immunity turns such that it cannot be determined before trial whether the defendants' conduct violated clearly established rights. *Hall v. Shipley*, 932 F.2d 1147, 1154 (6th Cir. 1991).

Defendant LaVigne was the warden at the relevant time concerning plaintiff's complaint. Liability under Section 1983 must be based on more than merely the right to control employees. *Polk Co. v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 325-26 (1981); *Monell v. New York City Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978). Thus, Section 1983 liability cannot be premised upon mere allegations of *respondeat superior*. *Monell*, 436 U.S. at 691; *Polk*, 454 U.S. at 325. A party cannot be held liable under Section 1983 absent a showing that the party personally participated in, or otherwise authorized, approved or knowingly acquiesced in, the allegedly unconstitutional conduct. *See e.g. Leach v. Shelby Co. Sheriff*, 891 F.2d 1241, 1246 (6th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 495 U.S. 932 (1990); *Hays v. Jefferson*, 668 F.2d 869, 874 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 833 (1982). *See also Bellamy v. Bradley*, 729 F.2d 416, 421 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied* 469 U.S. 845 (1984).

Supervisory officials can be held liable for the acts of their subordinates only if plaintiff establishes that the supervisor failed to appropriately discharge his supervisory duties, and

that this failure resulted in a denial or deprivation of plaintiff's federal rights. *See e.g. Leach*, 891 F.2d at 1246; *Hayes v. Vessey*, 777 F.2d 1149, 1154 (6th Cir. 1985). However, the failure of a supervisor to supervise, control or train the offending employee is not actionable absent a showing that the official implicitly encouraged, authorized, approved or knowingly acquiesced in, or in some other way directly participated in, the offensive conduct. *Leach*, 891 F.2d at 1246. Such a claim requires, at a minimum, that the official had knowledge of the offending employee's conduct at a time when the conduct could be prevented, or that such conduct was otherwise foreseeable or predictable. *See e.g. Gibson v. Foltz*, 963 F.2d 851, 854 (6th Cir. 1992). In addition, plaintiff must show that defendant had some duty or authority to act. *See e.g. Birrell v. Brown*, 867 F.2d 956, 959 (6th Cir. 1989) (lower level official not liable for shortcomings of building); *Ghandi v. Police Dept. of City of Detroit*, 747 F.2d 338, 351 (6th Cir. 1984) (mere presence at the scene is insufficient grounds to impose Section 1983 liability in the absence of a duty to act); *accord Hall v. Shipley*, 932 F.2d 1147 (6th Cir. 1991). In addition, merely bringing a problem to the attention of a supervisory official is not sufficient to impose such liability. *See Shelly v. Johnson*, 684 F. Supp. 941, 946 (W.D. Mich. 1987) (Hillman, C.J.), *aff'd* 849 F.2d 228 (6th Cir. 1988). Finally, supervisory liability claims cannot be based on simple negligence. *Leach*, 891 F.2d at 1246; *Weaver v. Toombs*, 756 F. Supp. 335, 337 (W.D. Mich. 1989), *aff'd* 915 F.2d 1574 (6th Cir. 1990).

It is clear that plaintiff has named defendant LaVigne because of his capacity as warden of the facility. Clearly, defendant LaVigne was never involved in processing plaintiff's mail. In the opinion of the undersigned, defendant LaVigne is entitled to dismissal from this action for lack of personal involvement.

Defendant Mather was involved in the processing of the mail because plaintiff alleges that he gave his mail to defendant Mather. However, plaintiff has presented no evidence that defendant Mather was responsible for the mail not reaching the Court of Appeals. Plaintiff actually mis-addressed the mail. Plaintiff addressed his mail to:

To Clerk: Michigan Court of Appeal  
Third Circuit Court  
Frank Murphy Hall of Justice  
1441 St. Antoine, 12th Floor  
Detroit, Michigan 48226

This is not the location of the Michigan Court of Appeals. Nevertheless, plaintiff argues that his mail should have reached the Michigan Court of Appeals because the Third Circuit Court would have delivered the mail to the Michigan Court of Appeals after receipt. Whether the Third Circuit would have delivered the mail to the Michigan Court of Appeals has not been established by the plaintiff in this case. It is just as likely that a clerk with the Third Circuit received this document and filed it in a case file involving plaintiff. However, the real issue in this case is the responsibility of defendant Mather. It is undisputed that defendant Mather received the envelope from plaintiff. It is also undisputed that defendant Mather delivered the mail to the mail room where it was processed.

Plaintiff was informed that:

We have on file in the Business Office a disbursement dated July 1, 2003 for an item of legal mail to the Clerk of the Michigan Court of Appeals, Detroit. It has our mail room's stamp on it indicating that it was processed as a loan of postage. In addition, we have an accounting record showing the processing of a postage loan on July 3. The item in question would have been picked up by the Kincheloe Post Office on either July 2 or July 3 depending on the time of day it arrived in our mail room.



Plaintiff has presented nothing that suggests that defendant Mather caused his mail to be mis-delivered or not delivered.

Accordingly, it is recommended that defendants LaVigne's and Mather's motion for summary judgment (Docket #132) be granted. Defendants Dennis Farney and Derek Smith would necessarily remain as the only defendants in this action.

NOTICE TO PARTIES: Objections to this Report and Recommendation must be served on opposing parties and filed with the Clerk of the Court within ten (10) days of receipt of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of any further right to appeal. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). *See also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

/s/ Timothy P. Greeley  
TIMOTHY P. GREELEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: November 13, 2007